

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ELMA HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS ROBERT HUGHES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01837-JAD-CWH

ORDER

Presently before the court is pro se Defendant Thomas Robert Hughes' motion (ECF No. 27) to reconsider, filed on September 19, 2016. Plaintiff filed a response (ECF No. 28) on September 21, 2016, and Defendant filed a reply (ECF No. 44) on October 5, 2016.

Defendant requests that the court reconsider its order (ECF No. 13), filed on September 12, 2016, denying Defendant's motion to clarify. However, Defendant's motion does not provide a basis for reconsideration. The original order was denied, without prejudice, for failure to cite any points and authorities, as required by Local Rule 7-2(a). Defendant does not show that his original motion was in fact supported by any authority. After curing this defect, Defendant is free to file a renewed motion, but the court's ruling on the original motion stands.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant's motion (ECF No. 27) to reconsider is DENIED.

DATED: October 18, 2016.


C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge